DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 089 RE 004 141

AUTHOR Fillmer, H. Thompson
TITLE Personality Type and Achievement in Reading.
PUB DATE May 72
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at annual meeting of International Reading Association (17th, Detroit, Michigan, May 10-13, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Effective Teaching; *Individual Differences; Learning Characteristics; *Personality Studies; *Reading Instruction; Research Needs; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Research has indicated that there is no teaching method superior to others in promoting reading skills, improving attitudes, or creating interests, and that different types of children evidence varying responses to different methods. Studies such as those of Jung and Myer regarding personality and learning styles provide clues that are useful in identifying the preferences for learning, yet very few studies have investigated the relationship between learning preferences and reading achievement. It has been shown that the choice of instructional methods makes a great difference for certain kinds of pupils, and a search for the best way to teach can succeed only when the learner's personality is taken into account. (AW)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 063089

Dr. H. Thompson Fillmer
Associate Professor
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY H. THOMPSON FILLMER
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

PERSONALITY TYPE AND ACHIEVEMENT IN READING

Improving Reading Research #2
Thursday, May 11, 1:30-2:30 P.M.

Improving Research in Reading

Reading is one of the most researched areas in the school curriculum. The vigor with which investigators explore this area stands as a testimony to its importance in the educational enterprise. As educators become increasingly accountable for pupil performance, knowledge about how pupils learn to read will be in even greater demand.

The great weight of research evidence identifies more questions than answers regarding this topic. For example, the most extensive single

RE004 141

reading investigation of recent years, The Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading, compared the various methods for teaching beginning reading. This study concluded that no method tested was superior to others in promoting reading skills, improving attitudes, or creating interests. One of the more significant findings of this investigation was that different types of children responded differently to different methods. (1) This finding is generally representative of the findings of investigations comparing different approaches to reading instruction. It also suggests a direction for improving research in reading. Investigations should be designed for the purpose of identifying preferred processes which affect the learning styles of individual pupils so that teachers might individualize reading instruction more effectively.

It is clear that some pupils learn more efficiently through a highly structured approach stressing sound-symbol relationships. Others learn better through a free-wheeling non-structured approach. Some pupils prefer to work alone on an assigned task. Others prefer to work cooperatively on a group project. Some pupils read whenever they get an opportunity. Others read only when they cannot avoid it. Research regarding personality and learning styles provides clues that are useful in identifying the preferences for learning.

Preferred Processes and Learning Styles

Jung in 1923 hypothesized that much apparently random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, and is the result of certain basic differences in people (4). These basic differences

concern ways that people prefer to use their minds. Myers (6) extended Jung's basic theory and derived the following eight basic preferences which people choose in using their minds. On preference is selected from each of the pairs below:

Index	Preference as between	Affects individual's choice to
EI	Extraversion or Introversion	Whether to direct perception and judgment upon environment or world of ideas
SN	Sensing or intuition	Which of these two kinds of perception to rely on
TF	Thinking or feeling	Which of these two kinds of judgment to rely on
JP	Judgment or perception	Whether to use judging or perceptive attitude for dealong with one's environment

The subject's learning style is defined by the letters of his four preferences. Sixteen different combinations are possible, each with its own set of characteristics. The descriptions of each combination for high school pupils have been summarized from Myers' research and are shown on the following pages (5).

Preferred Processes and Learning

Other investigations by Myers provide information regarding preferred processed and learning for the population in general. For instance, there are substantially more extraverts than introverts and more sensing than intuitive types. More males are thinking types and more females are feeling types. However, there are substantial numbers of feeling-type males and thinking-type females.

Intuitive types, who have a greater facility for dealing with symbols and abstractions, score higher than sensing types on intelligence

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPES IN HIGH SCHOOL

INTUITIVES

WITH FEELING	WITH THINKING
INFJ Gifted and original student who succeeds through combination of intelligence, perseverance, and desire to please. Puts his best efforts into his work because he wouldn't think of doing less than his best. Quiet, conscientious, considerate of others, widely respected if not popular, but suffers socially from unwillingness to compromise where a principle or conviction is involved.	**INTJ** Has a very original mind and a great amount of drive which he uses only when it pleases him. In fields which appeal to his imagination he has a fine power to organize a job or piece of work and carry it through with or without the help of others. He is always sceptical, critical and independent, generally determined, and often stubborn. Can never be driven, seldom led.
INFP Particularly enthusiastic about books, reads or tells the parts he likes best to his friends. Interested and responsive in class, always attentive and quick to see what the teacher is leading up to. Has a warm, friendly personality but is not sociable just for the sake of sociability and seldom puts his mind on his possessions or physical surroundings.	**INTP** Quiet, reserved, brilliant in exams, especially in theoretical or scientific subjects. Logical to the point of hair-splitting. Has no capacity for small talk and is uncomfortable at parties. Primarily interested in his studies and wouldn't care to be president of his class. Liked by his teachers for his scholarship and by the few fellow-students who get to know him for himself.
ENFP Warmly enthusiastic, high-spirited, ingenious, imaginative, can do almost anything that interests him. Quick with a solution for any difficulty and very ready to help people with a problem on their hands. Often relies on his spur-of-the-moment ability to improvise instead of preparing his work in advance. Can usually talk his way out of any jam with charm and ease.	**ENTP** Quick, ingenious, gifted in many lines, lively and stimulating company, alert and outspoken, argues for fun on either side of any question. Resourceful in solving new and challenging problems, but tends to neglect routine assignments as a boring waste of time. Turns to one new interest after another. Can always find excellent reasons for whatever he wants.
ENFJ Responsive and responsible. Feels a real concern for what others think and want, and tries always to handle things with due regard for the other fellow's feelings and desires. Can lead a group discussion or present a proposal with ease and tact. Sociable, popular, active in school affairs, but puts time enough on his lessons to do good work.	**ENTJ** Hearty, frank, able in studies and a leader in activities. Particularly good in anything requiring reasoning and intelligent talk, like debating or public speaking. Well-informed and keeps adding to his fund of knowledge. May be a bit too positive in matters where his experience has not yet caught up with his self-confidence.

INTROVERTS — PERCEPTIVE — JUDGING

EXTRAVERTS — PERCEPTIVE — JUDGING

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPES IN HIGH SCHOOL

SENSING TYPES

	WITH THINKING	WITH FEELING
INTROVERTS JUDGING PERCEPTIVE	**ISTJ** Serious, quiet, earns his success by earnest concentration and unhurried thoroughness. Logical and orderly in his work and dependable in all he does. Sees to it that everything he touches is well organized. Takes responsibility of his own accord. Makes up his own mind as to what should be accomplished and works toward it steadily, regardless of protests or distractions.	**ISFJ** Quiet, friendly, responsible and conscientious. Works devotedly to meet his obligations and serve his friends and school. Thorough and painstaking, accurate with figures, but needs time to master technical subjects, as reasoning is not his strong point. Patient with detail and routine. Loyal, considerate, concerned with how other people feel even when they are in the wrong.
INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE	**ISTP** Quiet, reserved, a sort of cool onlooker at life, observing and analyzing it with detached curiosity and unexpected flashes of original humor. Interested mainly in mechanics, in cars, in sports and in business. Exerts himself only as much as he considers actually necessary, even if he happens to be a star athlete.	**ISFP** Retiring, quietly friendly, sensitive, hates argument of any kind, is always too modest about his abilities. Has no wish to be a leader, but is a loyal, willing follower. Puts things off to the last minute and beyond. Never really drives himself about anything, because he enjoys the present moment and does not want it spoiled.
EXTRAVERTS PERCEPTIVE	**ESTP** Matter-of-fact, doesn't worry or hurry, always has a good time. Likes mechanical things, cars and sports, with friends on the side. A little blunt and insensitive. Can take school or leave it. Won't bother to follow a wordy explanation, but comes alive when there is something real to be worked, handled or taken apart. Can do math and technical stuff when he sees he will need it.	**ESFP** Outgoing, easygoing, uncritical, friendly, very fond of a good time. Enjoys sports and making things, restless if he has to sit still. Knows what's happening and joins in helpfully. Literal-minded, tries to remember rather than to reason, is easily confused by theory. Has good common sense and practical ability, but is not at all interested in study for its own sake.
EXTRAVERTS JUDGING	**ESTJ** Practical, realistic, matter-of-fact, with a natural head for business. Likes the mechanics of things. Not interested in subjects that he sees no actual use for, but can apply himself when necessary. Is good at organizing and running school activities, but sometimes rubs people the wrong way by ignoring their feelings and viewpoints.	**ESFJ** Warm-hearted, talkative, popular, conscientious, interested in everyone, a born cooperator and active committee member. Has no capacity for analysis or abstract thinking, and so has trouble with technical subjects, but works hard to master the facts in a lesson and win approval. Works best with plenty of praise and encouragement. Always doing something nice for someone in a practical way.

tests, college boards and similar examinations. Intuitive types represented 79% of gifted 7-9th grade males; 88% of gifted 7-9th grade females; 83% of National Merit Finalists; 97% of MacKinnon's creative men and 96% of his creative women.

It appears that sensing types, whose intelligence is more in practical performance than in the verbalizations about performance, are penalized at all levels by commonly used assessment instruments. Perceptual types, with their greater curiosity and openness, appear to pick up more information and in many studies score a bit higher in intelligence tests than comparable judging types. But judging types with their planned, organized attitude toward life, frequently show higher academic achievement than the comparable perceiving types. Perceptive types are more likely to be "underachievers" and judging types to be "overachievers" (6).

Few studies have investigated the relationship between learning preferences and reading achievement. Of those appearing in the literature three levels of education have been included: Grimes and Allinsmith (3) worked with an elementary population; Smith (7) worked with a high school population; and Smith, Wood, Downer and Raygor (8) worked with a college population. All three studies identified students possessing particular personality characteristics and used various teaching approaches as the variables.

The findings of the investigations can all be described by the conclusions of Grimes and Allinsmith that "the choice of instructional methods made a big difference for certain kinds of pupils, and a search for the 'best' way to teach can succeed only when the learner's personality is taken into account." (3).

One of the most conspicuous relationships pointed out by personality research is the apparent advantage of intuitive types and the apparent disadvantage of sensing types in symbolic learning. The ease with which intuitives perceive symbolic relationships and their rapid boredom with repetition indicates that an unstructures approach to reading with opportunities for independent reading might well be the most efficient method.

The need for structure and the enjoyment of repetition of the sensing types indicates a need for a highly structured reading program stressing the sound-symbol relationship. Sensing types outnumber intuitives three to one in the general population. This fact might explain why the research reviewed by Chall indicated that reading approaches stressing sound-symbol relationships are most effective for the greatest number of pupils (2). Personality research would support this conclusion.

Other basic hypotheses emerging grom the research data available on learning preferences and reading achievement that suggest further consideration and research are:

1. Pupils have definite learning styles that cause them to prefer particular methods, materials and activities.

2. Learning preferences are identifiable through the use of tests, checklists, tasks, or systematic observation.

3. Identifying pupils according to learning style may be more useful them classifying then as black, disadvantaged, slow, and numerous other educationally meaningless classifications.

4. Pupils allowed to utilize their preferred learning styles will learn more efficiently.

5. An awareness of the various types of learning styles will help teachers to better understand their pupils and will help pupils to better understand and accept the strengths and weaknesses of themselves and their classmates with regard to the learning process.

HF:clt

5.8.72

Bibliography

1. Bond, Guy L. and Robert Dykstra. "The Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading," Reading Research Quarterly, 2:5-142, Summer, 1967.

2. Chall, Jeanne. Learning to Read: The Great Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

3. Grimes, Jesse W. and Wesley Allinsmith. "Compulsivity, Anxiety, and School Achievement," Merril-Palmer Quarterly, 7:247-271, October, 1961.

4. Jung, Carl C. Psychological Types. London: Rutledge and Kegar Paul, 1923.

5. Myers, Isabel-Briggs. Introduction to Type. Swathmore, Pa.: Isabel Briggs Myers, 1970.

6. _____. Manual for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1962.

7. Smith, D. E. P. "Fit Teaching Methods to Personality Structure." High School Journal, 39: 167-71, December, 1955.

8. Smith, D. E. P., Roger L. Wood, James W. Downer and Alton L. Raygor. "Reading Improvement as a Function of Student Personality and Teaching Method," The Journal of Educational Psychology. 47:47-59, January, 1956.